UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,154	11/24/1999	PAUL S. GERMSCHEID	33012/274/10	4721

7590   01/25/2002

CHARLES A JOHNSON
UNISYS CORPORATION
LAW DEPARTMENT M S 4773
2470 HIGHCREST ROAD
ROSEVILLE, MN 55113

EXAMINER
WASSUM, LUKE S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

H·G

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/448,154	GERMSCHEID ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Luke S. Wassum	2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _24 November 1999_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _24 November 1999_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a) When acronyms are used, they should be defined upon first use, and not thereafter. In

the specification, there are instances where an acronym is used and not defined until

later (see page 8, line 3 "ASP"; subsequently defined at page 19, line 18). See 35 USC

112 (1) and 37 CFR 1.71(a).

b) internet terminal 54 should be 64 to correspond with Figure 4; see page 19, lines 5, 6 and

13; also page 20 lines 13 and 22; also page 22 line 5;

c) on page 23, line 1, there is a typographical error "Cool ICEA";

d) on page 24, line 3, there is an erroneous comma included "Fig,. 4";

e) on pages 1 and 2 "Cross-Reference", the serial number, filing date, and current status

(including the patent number of any issued patents) should be included in the cross-

reference;

f) there are instances in the specification where reference is made to "the above-referenced

application". Given the number of co-pending applications cited, the specific

application number and title of any referenced applications should be included in any

citations in the body of the specification; see page 20, line 2; also page 24, line 14; also

page 33 lines 9-10; also page 34, lines 1-2.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 44, line 5, there is a typographical error "data baser".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brown et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,941,947).

6.   Regarding claim 1, **Brown et al.** teaches an improvement in a data processing environment as claimed, comprising security profile corresponding to a site whereby a user terminal is permitted

to access at least one data entity (see Figures 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10; see also col.

16, line 28 through col. 19, line 7).

Brown et al. does not explicitly teach a system wherein the data entity accessed by the user

terminal is a database in a database management system.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to extend the teaching of Brown et al. to include access to a database in a database

management system, since databases are used to store a significant amount of the data available on

the Internet; furthermore, obviousness is also evidenced in view of the teaching in Brown et al. that

some of the data entities may include, for example, data files (see col. 1, lines 19-23), and that other

embodiments of the taught invention may be directed to the security of entirely different data

objects and data entities than that of the preferred embodiment, one example being files in a file

system (see col. 31, line 62 through col. 32, line 2).

7.   Regarding claim 6, Brown et al. teaches an apparatus comprising:

        a) a user terminal located at a site (see client microcomputers 102 in Figure 1; see also col. 6,

            lines 61-66);

        b) a data entity responsively coupled to said user terminal via a publicly accessible digital data

            communication network (see col. 2, lines 20-25); and

        c) a security profile generated by the system corresponding to said site whereby said system

            provides access to a particular portion of said data entity corresponding to said

security profile (see Figures 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10; see also col. 16,

line 28 through col. 19, line 7).

Brown et al. does not explicitly teach a system wherein the data entity accessed by the user

terminal is a database in a database management system.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to extend the teaching of Brown et al. to include access to a database in a database

management system, since databases are used to store a significant amount of the data available on

the Internet; furthermore, obviousness is also evidenced in view of the teaching in Brown et al. that

some of the data entities may include, for example, data files (see col. 1, lines 19-23), and that other

embodiments of the taught invention may be directed to the security of entirely different data

objects and data entities than that of the preferred embodiment, one example being files in a file

system (see col. 31, line 62 through col. 32, line 2).

8.   Regarding claim 11, Brown et al. teaches a method of utilizing a user terminal located at a

site to access a remote data entity via a publicly accessible digital data communication network,

comprising:

  a) transmitting a service request requiring access to said data entity from said user terminal

     (see col. 2, lines 34-36);

  b) receiving said service request by remote system (see col. 3, line 45 through col. 4, line 14);

  c) determining a security profile corresponding to said site (see col. 3, line 45 through col. 4,

     line 14);

d) comparing said security profile with said service request (see col. 3, line 45 through col. 4,

line 14); and

e) honoring said service request if and only if said service request corresponds to said

security profile (see col. 3, line 45 through col. 4, line 14).

Brown et al. does not explicitly teach a system wherein the data entity accessed by the user

terminal is a database in a database management system.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to extend the teaching of **Brown et al.** to include access to a database in a database

management system, since databases are used to store a significant amount of the data available on

the Internet; furthermore, obviousness is also evidenced in view of the teaching in **Brown et al.** that

some of the data entities may include, for example, data files (see col. 1, lines 19-23), and that other

embodiments of the taught invention may be directed to the security of entirely different data

objects and data entities than that of the preferred embodiment, one example being files in a file

system (see col. 31, line 62 through col. 32, line 2).

9.   Regarding claim 16, **Brown et al.** teaches an apparatus comprising:

a) means located at a site for permitting a user to interact with a data entity responsively

coupled via a publicly accessible digital data communication network (see col. 3, line

45 through col. 4, line 14);

b) means responsively coupled to said permitting means via said publicly accessible digital

data communication network for offering data processing services involving access to

said data entity in response to said service request (see col. 3, line 45 through col. 4,

line 14); and

c) means responsively coupled to said offering means for preventing said offering means

from offering said data processing services to said user in response to said service

request unless said site corresponds to a security profile wherein said security profile

permits access to said data entity (see col. 3, line 45 through col. 4, line 14).

Brown et al. does not explicitly teach a system wherein the data entity accessed by the user

terminal is a database in a database management system.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to extend the teaching of **Brown et al.** to include access to a database in a database

management system, since databases are used to store a significant amount of the data available on

the Internet; furthermore, obviousness is also evidenced in view of the teaching in **Brown et al.** that

some of the data entities may include, for example, data files (see col. 1, lines 19-23), and that other

embodiments of the taught invention may be directed to the security of entirely different data

objects and data entities than that of the preferred embodiment, one example being files in a file

system (see col. 31, line 62 through col. 32, line 2).

10.   Regarding claim 2, **Brown et al.** additionally teaches an improvement wherein said security

profile is generated by said data management system (see col. 17, line 25 through col. 18, line 39).

11. Regarding claims 3, 8, 12, 13 and 18, **Brown et al.** additionally teaches an improvement, method and apparatus further comprising a special field responsively coupled to a service request whereby said database management system receives said special field and generates said security profile corresponding to said site and to said special field (see col. 2, lines 34-36; see also col. 17, line 25 through col. 18, line 39).

12. Regarding claims 4, 14 and 17, **Brown et al.** additionally teaches an improvement, method and apparatus wherein said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the Internet (see col. 1, lines 57-67).

13. Regarding claim 7, **Brown et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said user terminal accesses said data entity by transferring a service request to said system (see col. 2, lines 34-36).

14. Claims 5, 9, 10, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brown et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,941,947) in view of **Admitted Prior Art.**

15. Regarding claims 5, 9, 15 and 19, **Brown et al.** teaches an improvement to a data processing environment, method and apparatus substantially as claimed.

Brown et al. does not teach the improvement, method and apparatus wherein said database management system is MAPPER.

However, it is taught as **Admitted Prior Art** that one of the most successful database management systems is MAPPER (see page 3, lines 7-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use MAPPER as the database management system, since MAPPER is one of the most successful database management systems, and so would be likely to satisfy a wide variety of user requirements.

16.   Regarding claim 10, **Brown et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the World Wide Web (see col. 1, lines 57-67).

17.   Regarding claim 20, **Brown et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said permitting means further comprises an industry standard personal computer (see col. 6, lines 62-66).

Conclusion

18.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

     Gebauer (U.S. Patent 6,324,539) teaches the instant invention.

     Bae et al. (U.S. Patent 6,295,531) teaches the instant invention.

     Ogram (U.S. Patent 6,085,324) teaches a regulatory system for a distributed system of computers in which authorized data files are marked with an indicia, which acts as a "stamp" used to grant or deny passage of the data file to selected users.

      Blakley, III et al. (U.S. Patent 6,067,623) teaches a system and method for controlling

client access to enterprise resources through a middle tier server.

      Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,052,785) teaches a system and method for managing client

authorization to access remote data repositories through a middle tier server such as a web server.

      White (U.S. Patent 6,049,877) teaches a system for authorizing a client request to a web

server to extract a CGI application.

      Rabne et al. (U.S. Patent 6,006,332) teaches a system for controlling access to digitized data

through the use of a Rights Management (RM) server.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 703-305-5706. The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and

703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner

at 703-746-5658.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Luke S. Wassum
Art Unit 2177

lsw
January 23, 2002

JEAN R. HOMERE
PRIMARY EXAMINER